

REMARKS

The Office Action of May 18, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully noted.

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1-2, and 4-8 have been amended. Claims 9-14 have been added without the addition of any new matter. In accordance with the Action, Claims 2 and 6 have rewritten in independent form, including the features of any intervening claims, making these claims and dependent claims 3-4, and 6-8 allowable.

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Montgomery (U.S. Patent No. 4,211,497). Claims 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montgomery. Claim 7 stands rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montgomery in view of Mickievicz et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and requests allowance thereof in the pending application for the following reasons.

The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

Claims 1 and 4 are not anticipated by Montgomery

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under § 102(b) in view of Montgomery. Montgomery fails to disclose the features recited in these claims as amended such as a keyboard comprising a first circuit board having a first plurality of circuit patterns printed

thereon, and a second plurality of circuit patterns printed thereon, a second circuit board, separate from said first circuit board, carrying an encoder circuit thereon, a first elongate, flexible flat cable comprising a corresponding plurality of first conductors each being connected to one of said first plurality of circuit patterns, and a second elongate, flexible flat cable comprising a corresponding plurality of second conductors each being connected to one of said second plurality of circuit patterns, wherein said second circuit board including a first connector connecting said first flat cable to said encoder circuit and a second connector connecting said second flat cable to said encoder circuit.

Montgomery fails to disclose these recited features. In contrast, Montgomery discloses a data input system having a keyboard 152 which does not include an encoder 156 (see FIG. 8). As clearly illustrated in FIG. 8, keyboard 152 is separate and distinct from encoder 156 in contrast to the recited feature of a keyboard including a second circuit board, separate from a first circuit board, carrying an encoder circuit. Keyboard 152 of Montgomery does not carry an encoder circuit as recited as the encoder 156 is separate and distinct from the keyboard 152.

Further, Montgomery solely discloses connecting the encoder 156 to the keyboard 152 using a single cable 60 via connector 154 as shown in FIGs. 3, 8 in contrast to using first and second

elongate, flexible flat cables to connect the encoder circuit to the first circuit board as recited. Montgomery makes no mention of using two elongate, flexible flat cables to connect a first circuit board with an encoder circuit on a second circuit board. Instead, Montgomery uses an encoder circuit 156, completely separate from the keyboard 152, that connects to the keyboard using a single cable 60 via connector 154. Also, cable 60 is not flat as shown in FIG. 3 in contrast to the recited features.

Montgomery fails to disclose the recited features making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claims 5 and 8 are not made obvious by Montgomery

Claims 5 and 8 stand rejected under § 103(a) in view of Montgomery. As contended above, Montgomery fails to disclose the recited features of a keyboard comprising a first circuit board having a first plurality of circuit patterns printed thereon, and a second plurality of circuit patterns printed thereon, a second circuit board, separate from said first circuit board, carrying an encoder circuit thereon, a first elongate, flexible flat cable comprising a corresponding plurality of first conductors each being connected to one of said first plurality of circuit patterns, and a second elongate, flexible flat cable comprising a corresponding plurality of second conductors each being connected to one of said

second plurality of circuit patterns, wherein said second circuit board including a first connector connecting said first flat cable to said encoder circuit and a second connector connecting said second flat cable to said encoder circuit.

In strong contrast, Montgomery solely discloses using an encoder 156 completely separate from the keyboard 152, and only connecting to the encoder using a single, non-flat cable 60 via connector 154 making the claimed invention non-obvious and patentably distinct from the cited reference.

Claim 7 is not made obvious by Montgomery and Mickievicz

Claim 7 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Montgomery and Mickievicz. This claim rejection has been rendered moot as Claim 7 has been amended to be dependent on allowable claim 6 in accordance with the Action.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, this application appears to be in condition for allowance and the Examiner is, therefore, requested to reexamine the application and pass the claims to issue.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Clint A. Gerdine (Reg. No. 41,035) at

telephone number (703) 205-8000, which is located in the Washington, DC area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By *Clint Dordine 4/10/05*
Michael K. Mutter, Reg. No. 29,680

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MKM/CAG:tm
0378-0387P